

### **REMARKS**

Review and reconsideration of the Final Office Action mailed May 28, 2008 (hereinafter "Office Action"), in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-40 and 42-49 were pending, with claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 22, 39 and 42-49 being drawn to an elected invention. By this Response, claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 39, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47 and 49 are amended and claims 1, 4-7, 10-21, 23-38, 40 and 48 are cancelled.

By this Response, more claims are cancelled (35) than are added (33) through multiple dependencies and, while two multiple dependent claims have been added, at least 10 multiple dependent claims have been cancelled (claims 13, 16, 17, 20, 21, 25, 30, 31, 33, 34). Accordingly, no claim fees are believed due and the proposed amendment is believed to be in compliance with claim limit following a final Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that all proposed claim amendments place the application in better condition for allowance and respectfully request entry of the proposed claim amendments.

Applicants are not conceding in this Application that the amended claims are not patentable, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuation or divisional patent applications.

## **II. INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Marvich for extending the courtesy of telephonic Interviews with Applicants' representative, Gregory M. Lefkowitz, held June 24, 2008

and July 17, 2008. During the Interview, Examiner Marvich clarified that the withdrawal of the restriction requirement found in the Office Action was intended to extend only to claim 46, not all withdrawn claims.

Applicants also raised the possibility of amending the dependencies of claims 8, 9 and 44-46. Examiner Marvich advised (i) that Applicants could not add more claims than are cancelled without filing a Request for Continued Examination, and (ii) such an amendment seemed acceptable, but could raise new issues. Accordingly, no firm agreement regarding the outcome of the proposed amendment was reached.

### **III. OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS AND CLAIM AMENDMENTS**

Claims 2, 3, 42, and 46-49 were objected to because of informalities. By this Amendment, claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 39, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47 and 49 are amended. The claim amendments seek to address the objections identified by in the Office Action and some minor clarifications. In addition, claims 8, 9 and 44-46 to introduce the multiple dependencies discussed during the Examiner Interviews. It is believed that these claim amendments do not raise new issues and Applicants respectfully request entry thereof.

### **IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103**


Claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103, as being unpatentable over the combination of Van de Löcht, Pears, Searle, and Comai (all of record). By this Amendment, claim 48 is canceled, which renders the rejection moot.

## V. CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, the independent claims are believed to be allowable. In addition, the dependent claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependence on an allowable base claim and for further features recited therein. The application is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. If any issues remain outstanding, Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned Greg Lefkowitz (561-671-3624 – direct line) if it is believed that a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

**AKERMAN SENTERFITT**



Date: October 13, 2008

Gregory A. Nelson, Reg. No. 30,577  
Gregory M. Lefkowitz, Reg. No. 56, 216  
AKERMAN SENTERFITT  
P.O. Box 3188  
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188  
Tel: 561-653-5000

Docket No. 9730-1